## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/891,367	06/27/2001	Masakatsu Shimizu	0505-0840P	0505-0840P 2385	
2292	7590 04/28/2006		EXAMINER		
BIRCH ST PO BOX 74	EWART KOLASCH	RUDY, AT	RUDY, ANDREW J		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3627		
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/200	DATE MAILED: 04/28/2006	
		· ·			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/891,367	SHIMIZU ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Andrew Joseph Rudy	3627				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	i. ely filed the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Fe	ebruary 2006.					
2a)□							
3)□	<del></del>						
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,15,16 and 21-23</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)🖂	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9,15,16 and 21-23</u> is/are rejected.						
7)							
8)[	·						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
·	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) 🗆	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
	a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (					
_	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Pa		-152)			
	No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	.,	•			

Application/Control Number: 09/891,367 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 21, 2006 has been entered. Applicant's REMARKS have been reviewed in light of the Amended claim language. The previous rejection is withdrawn as a result thereof.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-9, 15, 16, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Letcher et al., US 5,581,672 in view of Evans et al., US 6,775,647.

Letcher discloses an iterative process for estimating the manufacturing cost of an object, e.g. a product, via a computer aided design system/method using a display device, e.g. 14. Letcher does not disclose the term cost calculator processor.

The computer of Lechter would inherently comprise a memory and processor.

Nonetheless, computer systems having a memory and processors have been common knowledge in the computer art.

Evan discloses an apparatus comprising an input device, a cost calculator processor, e.g. 16, a display device, e.g. 10, physical characteristics, e.g. step 32.

To have provided a cost calculator processor for calculating a manufacturing cost for a product for Lechter would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Evan.

Official Notice is taken that split screens for simultaneously displaying and analyzing data at various stages, e.g. Hoskins, US 6,98,412.

To have provided the data for Lechtor, as modified by Evans, to have been provided on a split screen would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

It is noted Applicant's claim language is replete with intended claim language, e.g. "for estimating," "adapted to." Such claim language is given patentable weight, but less patentable weight than positively recited claim language. As is, the Letcher, as modified by Evan, disclosure is deemed able to carry out Applicant's claim language. Applicant's REMARKS have been reviewed, but are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

4. Further pertinent references of interest are noted on the attached PTO-892 that teach various aspects of Applicant's claim language.

Application/Control Number: 09/891,367 Page 4

Art Unit: 3627

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Joseph Rudy whose telephone number is 571-

272-6789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Joseph Rudy

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3627